

Dropout Prevention Services and Programs in Public School Districts: 2010-11

Dropout Prevention Services and Programs in Public School Districts: 2010–11

First Look

September 2011

Priscilla Rouse Carver
Laurie Lewis
Westat

Jared Coopersmith
Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education

Arne Duncan
Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences

John Q. Easton
Director

National Center for Education Statistics

Jack Buckley
Commissioner

Early Childhood, International, and Crosscutting Studies Division

Val Plisko
Associate Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high-priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high-quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public. Unless specifically noted, all information contained herein is in the public domain.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to

NCES, IES, U.S. Department of Education
1990 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006-5651

September 2011

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page address is <http://nces.ed.gov>.

The NCES World Wide Web Publications and Products address is <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

This report was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics under Contract No. ED-04-CO-0059/0025 with Westat. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Suggested Citation

Carver, P.R., and Lewis, L. (2011). *Dropout Prevention Services and Programs in Public School Districts: 2010–11* (NCES 2011-037). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

For ordering information on this report, write to

ED Pubs
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 22207
Alexandria, VA 22304

or call toll free 1-877-4-ED-Pubs or order online at <http://www.edpubs.gov>.

Content Contact

Jared Coopersmith
(202) 219-7106
jared.coopersmith@ed.gov

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to recognize the respondents from public school districts who provided data on dropout prevention services and programs upon which the report is based.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Selected Findings	3
Tables	5
Appendix A: Standard Error Tables	A-1
Appendix B: Technical Notes	B-1
Appendix C: Questionnaire	C-1

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	7
2. Percent of public school districts with high school grades offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	9
3. Percent of public school districts with high school grades reporting that various educational options are available to students in the district, and the percent of those districts reporting that some or most students at risk of dropping out participate in the educational option, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	10
4. Percent of public school districts where information is regularly provided to receiving schools about the unique needs of individual at-risk students when the student transitions to a school at a higher instructional level, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	11
5. Percent of public school districts using various transition supports for all students in any of the district’s schools to help students transition between instructional levels, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	12
6. Percent of public school districts using various types of mentors in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by instructional level of the school in which mentors are used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	13
7. Percent of public school districts using a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms, by instructional level of the school in which it is used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	14
8. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	15
9. Percent of public school districts reporting that they work with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	18

Table	Page
10. Percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out and the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about various education and training options to students who appear highly likely to drop out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	19
11. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting whether the district tries to determine the status of students who do not return to school in the fall as expected, and the percentage distribution reporting whether the district follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	20
12. Percent of public school districts reporting that they use various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	21

Appendix A Tables

1a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-3
2a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts with high school grades offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-5
3a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts with high school grades reporting that various educational options are available to students in the district, and standard errors for the percent of those districts reporting that some or most students at risk of dropping out participate in the educational option, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-6
4a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts where information is regularly provided to receiving schools about the unique needs of individual at-risk students when the student transitions to a school at a higher instructional level, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-7
5a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using various transition supports for all students in any of the district’s schools to help students transition between instructional levels, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-8
6a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using various types of mentors in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by instructional level of the school in which mentors are used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-9

Table	Page
7a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms, by instructional level of the school in which it is used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-10
8a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-11
9a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they work with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-14
10a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out and the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about various education and training options to students who appear highly likely to drop out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-15
11a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting whether the district tries to determine the status of students who do not return to school in the fall as expected, and the standard errors for the percentage distribution reporting whether the district follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-16
12a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they use various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11	A-17
Appendix B Table	
B-1. Number and percent of responding public school districts in the study sample, and estimated number and percent of public school districts the sample represents, by selected district characteristics: School year 2010–11	B-4

Introduction

This report provides national estimates about dropout prevention services and programs in public school districts. The estimates presented in this report are based on a district survey about dropout prevention services and programs offered by the district or by any of the schools in the district during the 2010–11 school year. For this survey, dropout prevention services and programs were defined as services and programs intended to increase the rate at which students are staying in school, progressing toward graduation, or earning a high school credential. The survey was designed to be completed by all types of districts, including those without high school grades. The survey asked about services and programs that districts may provide to students at various levels, including those in elementary and middle/junior high school, that are designed to support students who are struggling academically or who may be at future risk of dropping out.

Specifically, the survey covered the following:

- Whether the district offered various services or programs specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school;
- Whether various educational options were available to students in the district, and if so, how many students at risk of dropping out participated in those educational options;
- Types of transition support services used to help all students transition from a school at one instructional level to a school at a higher instructional level (e.g., from middle school to high school);
- Whether information was provided to receiving schools about the unique needs of at-risk students transitioning from a school at one instructional level to a school at a higher instructional level;
- Whether the district used various types of mentors specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out;
- Use of a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms;
- Extent to which the district used various factors to identify students who were at risk of dropping out;
- Whether the district worked with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out;
- Whether the district provided information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out of school to students who appeared highly likely to drop out of school;
- Whether the district provided information about various education and training options to students who appeared highly likely to drop out of school;
- Whether the district tried to determine the status of students who were expected to return to school in the fall but who do not return as expected, and whether the district follows up before the next school year with students who drop out to encourage them to return to school; and
- Whether the district used various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the Institute of Education Sciences conducted this Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) survey in fall 2010. FRSS is a survey system designed to collect small amounts of issue-oriented data from a nationally representative sample of districts, schools, or teachers with minimal burden on respondents and within a relatively short period of time. The survey was mailed to 1,200 public school districts in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unweighted survey response rate was 91 percent and the weighted response rate using the initial base weights was 89 percent. The survey weights were adjusted for questionnaire nonresponse and the data were then weighted to yield national estimates that represent all public school districts in the United States.

The purpose of this report is to introduce new NCES data from the survey through the presentation of descriptive information. Because this report is purely descriptive in nature, readers are cautioned not to make causal inferences about the data presented here. These findings have been chosen to demonstrate the range of information available from the FRSS study rather than to discuss all of the data collected; they are not meant to emphasize any particular issue. The findings are estimates of dropout prevention services and programs available in public school districts rather than estimates of students served. Percentages of districts and students do not have the same distributions. For example, although only 5 percent of public school districts in the United States are located in cities, about 31 percent of all students are enrolled in these districts. The findings are based on self-reported data from public school districts.

All specific statements of comparisons made in the bullets have been tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using Student's *t*-statistics to ensure that the differences are larger than those that might be expected due to sampling variation. Adjustments for multiple comparisons were not included. Many of the variables examined are related to one another, and complex interactions and relationships have not been explored. Tables of standard error estimates are provided in appendix A. Detailed information about the survey methodology is provided in appendix B, and the questionnaire can be found in appendix C. Appendix B also includes definitions of the analysis variables (i.e., district characteristics) and terms used in the report.

Selected Findings

- Districts reported offering the following services or programs in at least one of their elementary, middle or junior high, and high schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out: tutoring (75, 79, and 84 percent, respectively), summer school (54, 58, and 67 percent, respectively), remediation classes (61, 69, and 79 percent, respectively), guided study hall/academic support (36, 63, and 70 percent, respectively), alternative schools or programs (20, 44, and 76 percent, respectively), and after-school programs (42, 45, and 45 percent, respectively) (table 1).
- A majority of districts with high school grades reported offering various services or programs in at least one of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, including credit recovery courses or programs (88 percent), smaller class size (72 percent), early graduation options (63 percent), and self-paced courses for purposes other than credit recovery (55 percent) (table 2).
- Among districts with high school grades that had career and technical high schools or courses available to students, the majority reported that some or most of their at-risk students participated in that option (table 3). Career and technical high schools were available in 58 percent of districts, with 75 percent of those districts reporting that some and 15 percent reporting that most at-risk students participate in that option. Career and technical courses at a regular high school were available in 83 percent of districts, with 66 percent of those districts reporting that some and 26 percent reporting that most at-risk students participate in the option.
- Eighty-four percent of districts reported regularly providing information to the receiving schools about the unique needs of individual at-risk students when students transition to a school at a higher instructional level (e.g., from middle school to high school) (table 4).
- Districts reported using the following transition supports for all students in at least one of the district's schools to help students transition between elementary school and middle or junior high school or between middle or junior high school and high school: An assigned student mentor (10 and 20 percent, respectively), an assigned adult mentor (17 and 26 percent, respectively), and an advisement class¹ (24 and 40 percent, respectively) (table 5).
- Districts reported using the following types of mentors in at least one of the district's elementary, middle or junior high, and high schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out: student mentors (25, 28, and 39 percent, respectively), school counselors, teachers, or school administrators who formally mentor (60, 66, and 77 percent, respectively), adult mentors employed by the district whose only job is to mentor students (6, 9, and 12 percent, respectively), and community volunteers (35, 30, and 30 percent, respectively) (table 6).
- The percentage of districts that reported using a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms in at least one of their elementary schools, middle or junior high schools, and high schools was 69 percent, 61 percent, and 49 percent, respectively (table 7).
- More than one-third of districts reported using the following factors to a large extent² to identify students who are at risk of dropping out: academic failure (76 percent), truancy or excessive absences (64 percent), and behaviors that warrant suspension or expulsion (45 percent) (table 8).
- Districts reported working with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out. Among those were child protective services (85 percent), a community mental health agency (73 percent), state or local government agencies that provide financial assistance to needy families (68 percent), churches or community organizations (54 percent), and a health clinic or hospital (50 percent) (table 9).

¹ An advisement class is one that is held regularly (e.g., weekly) and may include lessons on organizational and study skills, information on courses needed for graduation, and information about careers and college preparation.

² Response options in the questionnaire were "not at all," "small extent," "moderate extent," and "large extent."

- Fifty-five percent of districts reported that it was standard procedure to provide all students who appear highly likely to drop out with information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out. Some districts also reported that it was standard procedure to provide all students who appear highly likely to drop out with information about alternative schools or programs (63 percent), General Educational Development (GED) or adult education programs (53 percent), job training and GED combination programs (45 percent), and job training programs (30 percent) (table 10).
- Seventy-three percent of districts reported that it was standard procedure to follow up with all students in their district who do not return in the fall as expected to determine the status of those students before the next school year (table 11). Thirty-six percent of districts reported that it was standard procedure to follow up with all students in their district who dropped out to encourage them to return.
- Districts reported using various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts including: attendance rates (82 percent), dropout rates (79 percent), graduation rates (78 percent), the number or percentage of students failing courses or held back (76 percent), and the number of expulsions or other disciplinary actions (67 percent) (table 12).

Tables

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 1. Percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Tutoring			Summer school			Remediation classes ¹		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	75	79	84	54	58	67	61	69	79
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	73	76	81	52	51	56	56	62	73
2,500 to 9,999	76	83	87	57	74	86	70	83	91
10,000 or more	94	96	96	66	79	91	78	89	95
Community type									
City	91	92	92	69	81	90	72	87	92
Suburban	69	75	82	47	66	81	68	77	85
Town	80	88	91	61	67	82	68	81	85
Rural	75	77	81	53	51	54	55	61	74
Region									
Northeast	60	69	74	48	69	79	73	82	85
Southeast	93	95	95	56	65	77	76	82	89
Central	71	76	80	54	53	59	52	59	69
West	84	83	90	57	55	65	56	68	83
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	67	73	83	46	60	68	58	70	82
10 to 19 percent	75	79	82	56	56	65	61	67	76
20 percent or more	85	86	88	59	61	68	62	70	80

See notes at end of table.

Table 1. Percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Guided study hall/academic support ²			Alternative schools or programs ³			After-school programs		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	36	63	70	20	44	76	42	45	45
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	36	59	67	17	38	68	37	39	35
2,500 to 9,999	32	69	73	23	56	90	47	56	60
10,000 or more	40	76	83	40	74	99	70	76	80
Community type									
City	39	68	83	37	70	98	68	77	77
Suburban	30	59	73	20	42	80	43	54	56
Town	35	71	75	23	58	89	46	52	54
Rural	37	61	66	17	38	68	37	37	34
Region									
Northeast	44	68	83	15	38	74	36	48	45
Southeast	27	61	62	30	76	92	57	56	63
Central	35	67	68	17	43	74	38	40	39
West	34	56	68	22	37	73	44	46	43
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	37	64	79	16	41	74	34	42	46
10 to 19 percent	37	69	73	18	44	78	41	43	43
20 percent or more	32	53	59	25	49	76	50	52	47

¹ A remediation class is any class intended to bring students who are academically below grade level up to proficiency.

² Guided study hall/academic support period is typically for students who are struggling academically; teachers assist students by helping them manage their time and their assignments, and either provide or get them the academic support/tutoring that they need to complete homework and be successful in their classes. Teachers may also provide academic support in specific areas such as mathematics, reading, or social studies.

³ Alternative schools and programs are designed to address the needs of students that typically cannot be met in regular schools. The students who attend alternative schools and programs are typically at risk of educational failure (as indicated by poor grades, truancy, disruptive behavior, pregnancy, or similar factors associated with temporary or permanent withdrawal from school).

NOTE: Percents are based on the percent of public school districts with those grades (96 percent of districts have elementary school grades, 93 percent have middle/junior high school grades, and 81 percent have high school grades). Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 2. Percent of public school districts with high school grades offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Credit recovery courses/programs ¹	Smaller class size	Early graduation options	Self-paced courses for purposes other than credit recovery ²	Decelerated curriculum ³	Flexible school day	Summer bridge program ⁴	District administered GED preparation courses ⁵	Subsidized child care while teen parents attend classes
All public school districts	88	72	63	55	49	40	25	24	11
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	85	72	58	52	42	32	16	15	4
2,500 to 9,999	92	72	69	58	64	51	39	36	16
10,000 or more	97	79	85	72	65	71	63	56	49
Community type									
City	95	74	77	66	64	64	58	53	48
Suburban	86	71	62	50	61	52	40	26	15
Town	92	68	70	62	51	44	30	26	13
Rural	86	74	59	53	43	32	15	19	5
Region									
Northeast	72	75	55	42	67	47	25	27	7
Southeast	94	74	54	56	55	32	34	50	16
Central	90	67	69	56	47	37	21	16	7
West	91	76	65	61	38	43	27	19	17
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	86	73	72	54	56	53	29	17	7
10 to 19 percent	86	71	61	56	51	37	23	25	11
20 percent or more	92	73	58	54	40	34	25	27	14

¹ Credit recovery courses/programs are opportunities allowing students to recover course credits from classes they have missed or failed.

² Self-paced courses/independent study are opportunities for students to work through a course at their own pace, for example, through a computer-based program or packets of work, for purposes other than credit recovery.

³ Decelerated curriculum refers to a curriculum that is spread over a longer period of time than a regular course. An example of a decelerated curriculum is an algebra 1 course that is spread over 2 years or two class periods for an entire year. This definition applies to any curriculum that is decelerated specifically to meet the needs of students who may be at risk of failing a course.

⁴ Summer bridge programs are programs designed to provide assistance to students before transitioning from one instructional level school to another (e.g., from middle school to high school). These programs may include, but are not limited to, providing academic support, remedial opportunities, study skills, and opportunities to connect to teachers or peers at the new school.

⁵ GED is General Educational Development.

NOTE: Percents are based on the 81 percent of districts with high school grades. Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 3. Percent of public school districts with high school grades reporting that various educational options are available to students in the district, and the percent of those districts reporting that some or most students at risk of dropping out participate in the educational option, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Career/technical high school ¹			Career/technical courses at a regular high school			Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with a career/technical focus			Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with an academic focus			Work-based learning		
	Avail-able in district ²	How many at-risk students participate ³		Avail-able in district ²	How many at-risk students participate ³		Avail-able in district ²	How many at-risk students participate ³		Avail-able in district ²	How many at-risk students participate ³		Avail-able in district ²	How many at-risk students participate ³	
		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most
All public school districts	58	75	15	83	66	26	69	58	3	84	34	1!	67	67	7
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	54	73	15	79	63	29	66	55	3!	82	34	‡	61	63	7
2,500 to 9,999	68	76	18	86	71	23	73	61	3	86	30	2!	77	71	9
10,000 or more	63	82	10	98	82	15	88	67	4	92	46	‡	90	73	7
Community type															
City	64	79	14!	93	79	16	88	62	8!	91	44	‡	83	68	11
Suburban	74	77	15	74	74	20	63	55	4!	82	28	3!	71	70	9
Town	59	78	17	91	68	27	70	61	‡	84	32	‡	74	68	5!
Rural	52	72	14	82	62	28	69	57	3!	84	36	‡	62	65	7
Region															
Northeast	90	74	17	63	80	13	50	46	7!	76	24	‡	77	62	6
Southeast	57	62	30	90	61	32	75	64	‡	86	27	‡	68	68	12
Central	59	78	10	83	65	26	74	54	3!	88	32	‡	69	72	5!
West	37	80	12	93	65	28	72	66	‡	83	47	‡	57	61	8!
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	68	79	11	81	72	20	64	52	3!	81	33	‡	79	71	5
10 to 19 percent	56	74	17	82	63	29	72	59	3!	88	34	‡	65	64	8
20 percent or more	54	72	17	85	67	26	70	61	4!	80	34	3!	60	65	9!

! Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater.

¹ Career/technical high schools are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, technical, or professional occupations. Career/technical high schools included those that were available to students in the district and were administered either by the district or by a regional entity.

² Based on the 81 percent of districts with high school grades.

³ Based on the districts reporting that educational option as available.

NOTE: Response options in the questionnaire for the percent of students who participate in the educational option were “no or few at-risk students participate,” “some at-risk students participate,” and “most at-risk students participate.” Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 4. Percent of public school districts where information is regularly provided to receiving schools about the unique needs of individual at-risk students when the student transitions to a school at a higher instructional level, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Information provided to receiving school
All public school districts	84
District enrollment size	
Less than 2,500	83
2,500 to 9,999	88
10,000 or more	85
Community type	
City	86
Suburban	86
Town	88
Rural	82
Region	
Northeast	83
Southeast	87
Central	87
West	81
Poverty concentration	
Less than 10 percent	82
10 to 19 percent	88
20 percent or more	82

NOTE: Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 5. Percent of public school districts using various transition supports for all students in any of the district's schools to help students transition between instructional levels, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Transition from elementary to middle/junior high school ¹			Transition from middle/junior high school to high school ²		
	Assign a student mentor	Assign an adult mentor	Offer an advisement class ³	Assign a student mentor	Assign an adult mentor	Offer an advisement class ³
All public school districts	10	17	24	20	26	40
District enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	10	17	21	18	27	34
2,500 to 9,999	8	16	29	22	27	49
10,000 or more	13	12	33	27	24	59
Community type						
City	17	12	29	28	20	50
Suburban	9	14	25	24	25	45
Town	7	20	25	20	31	43
Rural	10	17	22	17	26	36
Region						
Northeast	5 [!]	11	22	18	28	39
Southeast	8	14	23	13	27	49
Central	13	22	27	23	26	36
West	9	14	22	20	26	40
Poverty concentration						
Less than 10 percent	13	16	26	29	28	42
10 to 19 percent	10	20	27	17	26	41
20 percent or more	7	13	17	15	26	36

[!] Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

¹ Based on the 93 percent of districts with middle/junior high school grades.

² Based on the 81 percent of districts with high school grades.

³ An advisement class is one that is held regularly (e.g., weekly) and may include lessons on organizational and study skills, information on courses needed for graduation, and information about careers and college preparation.

NOTE: Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 6. Percent of public school districts using various types of mentors in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by instructional level of the school in which mentors are used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Student mentors			School counselors, teachers, or school administrators who formally mentor students			Adult employed by the district whose only job is to mentor students			Community volunteers		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	25	28	39	60	66	77	6	9	12	35	30	30
District enrollment size												
Less than 2,500	23	25	32	58	62	75	6	8	10	27	22	20
2,500 to 9,999	27	32	50	61	76	80	6	9	15	46	44	42
10,000 or more	42	49	65	75	83	87	11	14	24	73	71	73
Community type												
City	44	50	66	65	73	80	10	14	23	65	66	70
Suburban	18	25	47	45	61	72	5!	5!	11	28	26	32
Town	28	32	48	63	74	77	8	14	15	45	44	38
Rural	25	26	31	63	65	78	6	8	10	31	24	22
Region												
Northeast	20	23	45	49	60	73	5!	7!	8!	22	17	21
Southeast	25	24	30	70	80	78	9	10	15	60	57	54
Central	29	31	41	61	66	75	6	7	11	33	30	24
West	25	30	38	61	66	82	7	10	15	35	28	31
Poverty concentration												
Less than 10 percent	22	29	46	49	57	72	7	7	11	30	29	29
10 to 19 percent	31	32	43	65	72	80	4	8	11	37	29	27
20 percent or more	21	23	28	63	68	76	9	11	16	36	34	34

! Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

NOTE: Percents are based on the percent of public school districts with those grades (96 percent of districts have elementary school grades, 93 percent have middle/junior high school grades, and 81 percent have high school grades). Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 7. Percent of public school districts using a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms, by instructional level of the school in which it is used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Use a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems ¹		
	Elementary schools	Middle/junior high schools	High schools
All public school districts	69	61	49
District enrollment size			
Less than 2,500	63	53	42
2,500 to 9,999	80	75	60
10,000 or more	91	90	78
Community type			
City	90	82	79
Suburban	75	67	56
Town	81	71	51
Rural	61	54	43
Region			
Northeast	76	65	53
Southeast	73	71	57
Central	69	61	45
West	63	55	48
Poverty concentration			
Less than 10 percent	69	63	50
10 to 19 percent	69	61	49
20 percent or more	69	59	48

¹ Formal program to reduce behavioral problems refers to a systematic program that is specifically designed to reduce behavioral problems and is implemented at the classroom or school level. Some examples of formal programs designed to reduce behavioral problems are Positive Behavioral Support and Positive Behavioral Intervention System.

NOTE: Percents are based on the percent of public school districts with those grades (96 percent of districts have elementary school grades, 93 percent have middle/junior high school grades, and 81 percent have high school grades). Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 8. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Truancy or excessive absences			Academic failure			Failure on state standardized tests			Behaviors that warrant suspension or expulsion			Behaviors that warrant other disciplinary action		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	11	26	64	8	16	76	31	37	32	17	38	45	29	44	27
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	14	28	58	11	18	71	37	36	27	20	39	41	33	44	23
2,500 to 9,999	4	22	75	2!	12	86	19	38	42	8	39	53	21	45	34
10,000 or more	3!	16	80	‡	9	90	16	36	48	7	30	64	14	45	40
Community type															
City	3!	20	77	3!	12	86	14	41	45	8	40	52	16	47	37
Suburban	11	20	69	9	12	79	22	38	40	16	36	48	26	41	32
Town	5!	21	74	‡	12	85	31	33	36	9	34	57	22	48	29
Rural	14	29	57	10	19	71	36	37	27	20	40	40	33	44	23
Region															
Northeast	16	22	62	13	15	72	35	37	29	18	33	48	26	41	33
Southeast	‡	15	82	‡	11	88	15	40	45	7	40	53	19	44	37
Central	9	29	62	7	18	75	37	36	27	17	38	45	28	47	25
West	13	28	59	9	17	74	29	37	34	19	40	41	36	44	20
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	17	27	56	12	18	69	31	38	31	23	35	42	34	39	27
10 to 19 percent	9	27	64	7	13	80	33	37	30	13	36	50	25	45	29
20 percent or more	8	22	70	6!	18	76	29	36	35	15	44	42	28	49	23

See notes at end of table.

Table 8. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Involvement with the criminal justice system			Involvement with social services or foster care			Pregnancy/teen parenthood			Substance abuse			Learning disability			Mental health problems		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	28	36	36	45	38	17	41	31	28	31	39	29	45	33	22	46	37	17
District enrollment size																		
Less than 2,500	31	37	32	48	37	15	46	29	25	35	39	26	50	30	20	51	35	14
2,500 to 9,999	19	33	48	39	40	21	31	36	33	22	39	39	37	40	23	35	41	24
10,000 or more	18	35	46	27	47	26	21	32	46	23	40	37	27	38	35	31	46	23
Community type																		
City	18	34	47	31	44	24	24	30	46	22	43	35	22	46	32	28	43	29
Suburban	33	33	35	50	35	15	49	25	26	32	33	35	46	35	20	43	40	17
Town	14	36	51	35	37	29	22	39	39	20	41	39	41	35	24	36	44	20
Rural	31	37	31	47	39	14	46	31	24	36	40	24	49	30	21	52	33	15
Region																		
Northeast	33	30	36	48	36	16	52	27	21	34	33	33	49	35	16	43	42	15
Southeast	16	33	51	29	50	21	20	44	37	27	42	31	31	35	34	34	44	22
Central	26	41	33	45	38	17	40	32	29	32	42	26	47	32	22	48	35	17
West	31	35	34	48	34	18	43	28	29	31	38	31	47	32	21	51	33	16
Poverty concentration																		
Less than 10 percent	37	29	34	50	32	18	54	21	24	40	30	31	50	32	18	48	34	17
10 to 19 percent	25	39	36	42	39	18	34	36	30	27	42	31	45	31	24	43	41	16
20 percent or more	23	38	39	42	42	16	38	33	29	30	44	26	42	36	22	49	34	17

See notes at end of table.

Table 8. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Observed change in student attitude or life conditions			Homelessness or frequent address change			Limited English proficiency			Migrant status			Other		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	34	44	23	38	32	30	59	28	13	69	21	10	98	1!	1
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	35	43	22	41	31	28	65	25	10	73	20	8	99	‡	‡
2,500 to 9,999	31	46	24	31	35	34	46	35	19	63	24	12	96	2!	2!
10,000 or more	25	48	27	19	37	44	33	39	29	50	29	21	95	3!	3!
Community type															
City	28	48	24	20	39	41	35	37	29	48	37	15	95	3!	3!
Suburban	39	38	23	44	31	25	56	30	15	74	16	10	98	‡	2!
Town	25	47	28	28	34	37	46	34	20	65	23	13	97	‡	‡
Rural	35	44	21	40	31	29	66	25	9	71	21	8	99	‡	‡
Region															
Northeast	33	43	25	41	35	23	68	24	8	78	15	6!	96	3!	‡
Southeast	31	45	24	29	33	38	48	32	20	54	31	15	98	‡	1!
Central	34	46	21	38	31	31	58	32	9	68	25	7	100 ¹	‡	‡
West	35	42	23	38	31	31	56	25	19	69	18	13	97	#	2!
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	37	39	23	42	31	27	64	26	10	77	16	6	98	1!	1!
10 to 19 percent	29	48	23	34	34	32	55	30	15	65	24	12	97	1!	2!
20 percent or more	36	42	22	38	32	31	57	28	15	67	23	10	99	‡	‡

Rounds to zero.

! Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater.

¹ Rounds to 100 percent.

NOTE: Response options in the questionnaire were “not at all,” “small extent,” “moderate extent,” and “large extent.” Responses for not at all and small extent were combined in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 9. Percent of public school districts reporting that they work with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Child protective services ¹	Community mental health agency ¹	State or local government agencies that provide financial assistance to needy families ¹	Churches or community organizations ¹	Crisis intervention center ¹	Juvenile assessment center ^{1,2}	Local business ¹	Drug and/or alcohol clinic ¹	Health clinic or hospital ³	Family planning/child placement agency ³	Child care centers/providers for children of teen parents ³	Job placement center ³
All public school districts	85	73	68	54	47	44	41	47	50	37	29	28
District enrollment size												
Less than 2,500	82	68	63	48	40	41	34	39	45	32	22	23
2,500 to 9,999	90	84	77	63	60	48	52	61	58	44	39	34
10,000 or more	94	92	87	88	76	63	72	79	73	56	67	55
Community type												
City	94	90	88	81	72	67	71	74	73	58	64	49
Suburban	81	77	67	49	58	41	37	59	50	36	30	29
Town	89	84	79	65	50	44	54	57	61	47	42	31
Rural	84	66	63	50	40	42	35	37	44	31	22	24
Region												
Northeast	90	83	68	45	59	34	33	62	53	42	30	34
Southeast	88	89	78	78	47	58	58	47	57	48	43	34
Central	85	71	72	55	47	50	46	47	51	38	26	25
West	79	62	59	51	40	37	34	36	44	27	27	24
Poverty concentration												
Less than 10 percent	83	73	65	48	50	37	36	53	50	37	23	28
10 to 19 percent	88	73	70	59	49	46	46	50	50	40	31	29
20 percent or more	81	73	67	55	41	47	38	35	48	32	33	25

¹Based on all public school districts.

²Juvenile assessment center is a centralized receiving, processing, and intervention facility that brings together community services for youth and families who have, or are likely to have, contact with the legal system.

³Based on the 96 percent of districts with middle/junior high school or high school grades.

NOTE: Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 10. Percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out and the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about various education and training options to students who appear highly likely to drop out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Employment or financial consequences of dropping out ¹		Education and training options							
			Alternative schools or programs ^{2,3}		Job training/GED combination programs ^{1,4}		GED or adult education programs ¹		Job training programs ^{1,5}	
	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students
All public school districts	55	30	63	19	45	26	53	24	30	33
District enrollment size										
Less than 2,500	56	28	59	19	44	22	51	22	29	29
2,500 to 9,999	55	34	71	21	48	34	58	29	33	39
10,000 or more	51	42	77	19	47	38	57	31	34	47
Community type										
City	52	40	75	20	53	32	57	27	38	44
Suburban	46	33	58	23	39	29	46	26	25	36
Town	63	28	77	15	49	31	57	27	35	38
Rural	56	29	59	19	45	22	54	23	30	29
Region										
Northeast	62	23	56	19	54	22	60	23	36	33
Southeast	65	33	72	20	59	25	72	24	40	36
Central	59	25	70	19	44	31	55	25	29	35
West	43	39	56	19	36	22	40	25	23	29
Poverty concentration										
Less than 10 percent	53	26	58	17	42	23	47	26	26	33
10 to 19 percent	58	32	67	19	47	30	58	24	31	35
20 percent or more	54	31	61	22	46	23	52	24	32	30

¹Based on the 96 percent of districts with middle/junior high school or high school grades.

²Based on all public school districts.

³Alternative schools and programs are designed to address the needs of students that typically cannot be met in regular schools. The students who attend alternative schools and programs are typically at risk of educational failure (as indicated by poor grades, truancy, disruptive behavior, pregnancy, or similar factors associated with temporary or permanent withdrawal from school).

⁴Job training and General Educational Development (GED) combination programs are programs that combine both job training and GED preparation courses. This includes programs such as Job Corps or the Army/National Guard GED program or other similar programs.

⁵Job training programs are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, or technical occupations. These programs do not include General Educational Development (GED) preparation or result in a high school diploma.

NOTE: Students who are highly likely to drop out of school include those with multiple risk factors, such as many unexcused absences, academic failure, or reoccurring behavior that warrants suspension or expulsion, or those who provide other strong indications that they are dropping out. Response options in the questionnaire were “yes, this is standard procedure with all students highly likely to drop out;” “yes, with some students;” and “no.” Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 11. Percentage distribution of public school districts reporting whether the district tries to determine the status of students who do not return to school in the fall as expected, and the percentage distribution reporting whether the district follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	District tries to determine status of students who do not return in the fall as expected			District follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return		
	Yes, for all students	Yes, with some students	No	Yes, for all students	Yes, with some students	No
All public school districts	73	14	12	36	34	30
District enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	72	14	14	35	32	33
2,500 to 9,999	77	15	8	37	38	25
10,000 or more	73	21	6	41	46	13
Community type						
City	73	18	9	39	44	17
Suburban	71	14	14	29	33	37
Town	79	14	7	38	38	24
Rural	73	14	13	38	32	30
Region						
Northeast	71	14	15	26	34	40
Southeast	80	15	5!	47	39	15
Central	75	13	12	35	34	31
West	71	16	13	41	32	27
Poverty concentration						
Less than 10 percent	70	11	20	32	30	38
10 to 19 percent	78	14	8	36	37	27
20 percent or more	71	19	11	41	35	25

! Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 12. Percent of public school districts reporting that they use various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Dropout rates ¹	Graduation rates ¹	Number of students attending adult education/ GED programs ^{1, 2}	Number of students taking or passing the GED test ^{1, 2}	Attendance rates ³	Number or percentage of students failing courses or held back ³	Number of expulsions or other disciplinary actions ³	State standardized test scores ³	Feedback from a district-administered parent or student survey ³	Other ³
All public school districts	79	78	31	28	82	76	67	59	42	1
District enrollment size										
Less than 2,500	74	73	28	25	78	72	62	53	39	‡
2,500 to 9,999	90	90	38	33	90	85	77	71	49	3
10,000 or more	92	93	41	38	96	88	82	77	56	6
Community type										
City	88	88	36	32	92	86	83	83	64	9
Suburban	74	74	29	24	81	72	66	58	38	1!
Town	89	88	31	28	87	84	75	59	43	‡
Rural	77	75	31	29	79	74	63	57	42	1!
Region										
Northeast	78	77	35	28	76	71	61	51	28	2!
Southeast	97	96	47	42	93	90	83	80	60	2!
Central	79	78	28	24	85	79	70	54	47	‡
West	73	72	25	27	78	71	61	63	41	1!
Poverty concentration										
Less than 10 percent	72	71	27	23	75	67	63	53	35	2!
10 to 19 percent	82	81	32	28	85	81	68	59	45	1!
20 percent or more	82	81	32	33	84	77	70	65	47	2!

! Interpret data with caution; the coefficient of variation is greater than or equal to 30 percent.

‡ Reporting standards not met. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 50 percent or greater.

¹ Based on the 96 percent of districts with middle/junior high school or high school grades.

² GED is General Educational Development.

³ Based on all public school districts.

NOTE: Poverty estimates for school districts were based on Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A

Standard Error Tables

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 1a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Tutoring			Summer school			Remediation classes		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.5
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.8
2,500 to 9,999	2.1	1.6	1.3	2.5	2.3	1.6	2.0	1.6	1.7
10,000 or more	1.7	1.7	1.1	3.3	2.4	2.2	3.2	1.8	1.2
Community type									
City	2.4	2.1	2.4	3.5	2.9	2.6	3.8	2.6	2.5
Suburban	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.7
Town	3.2	2.6	2.4	3.6	4.2	3.1	3.8	3.3	3.5
Rural	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.6	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
Region									
Northeast	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.5	4.1	3.6	3.5	3.0	3.8
Southeast	2.4	2.2	2.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.2	2.9
Central	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.8	3.8	3.1	3.5	3.8
West	2.2	2.3	2.2	3.5	3.9	4.1	3.4	3.3	3.5
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	3.5	3.6	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.4
10 to 19 percent	2.6	2.2	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.7
20 percent or more	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.7

See notes at end of table.

Table 1a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by instructional level of the school in which it was offered and district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Guided study hall/academic support			Alternative schools or programs			After-school programs		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7	2.1
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	2.2	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.3	3.0
2,500 to 9,999	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.2
10,000 or more	2.8	2.6	2.1	2.3	2.5	0.7	2.7	2.4	2.1
Community type									
City	4.4	4.1	3.1	3.9	3.4	1.2	4.2	3.8	3.6
Suburban	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.3
Town	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.2	4.0	3.3	3.7	3.6	4.1
Rural	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.2	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
Region									
Northeast	3.6	3.4	2.8	2.6	3.8	3.5	4.4	4.0	4.3
Southeast	3.8	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.3	3.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Central	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.3	3.1	2.6	3.6	3.1	3.3
West	3.1	3.8	4.1	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.7
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.4	3.0	3.5	3.1	3.1	4.0
10 to 19 percent	3.1	3.0	3.3	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.8
20 percent or more	3.0	4.3	4.1	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 2a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts with high school grades offering various services or programs in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Credit recovery courses/ programs	Smaller class size	Early graduation options	Self-paced courses for purposes other than credit recovery	Decelerated curriculum	Flexible school day	Summer bridge program	District administered GED preparation courses	Subsidized child care while teen parents attend classes
All public school districts	1.3	1.7	1.9	2.3	1.7	1.8	1.3	1.5	0.9
District enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	1.9	2.4	2.7	3.2	2.3	2.4	1.7	2.0	1.1
2,500 to 9,999	1.3	2.2	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.2	1.8
10,000 or more	1.2	2.5	1.9	3.7	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.4	2.9
Community type									
City	1.9	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.0
Suburban	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.3	2.3	1.9
Town	2.7	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.0	2.3
Rural	2.2	2.7	3.2	3.4	2.8	2.5	1.8	2.2	1.1
Region									
Northeast	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.6	3.8	4.3	3.8	3.7	1.7
Southeast	2.3	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.9	4.3	3.1
Central	2.4	3.0	3.6	3.5	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.1	1.3
West	2.8	3.1	3.8	3.7	3.5	4.0	2.8	2.3	1.8
Poverty concentration									
Less than 10 percent	2.6	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.8	2.8	2.4	1.2
10 to 19 percent	2.5	2.9	2.9	3.7	3.1	2.5	1.8	2.3	1.3
20 percent or more	2.1	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.1	2.3

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 3a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts with high school grades reporting that various educational options are available to students in the district, and standard errors for the percent of those districts reporting that some or most students at risk of dropping out participate in the educational option, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Career/technical high school			Career/technical courses at a regular high school			Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with a career/technical focus			Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with an academic focus			Work-based learning		
	Available in district	How many at-risk students participate		Available in district	How many at-risk students participate		Available in district	How many at-risk students participate		Available in district	How many at-risk students participate		Available in district	How many at-risk students participate	
		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most		Some	Most
All public school districts	2.0	2.1	1.7	1.3	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.1	0.8	1.6	1.6	0.4	2.0	2.6	1.0
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	2.8	3.2	2.6	1.9	2.9	3.0	2.7	3.0	1.3	2.4	2.3	†	3.0	4.0	1.5
2,500 to 9,999	2.2	2.4	2.2	1.6	3.0	2.9	2.0	3.1	0.9	1.5	2.1	0.7	1.9	2.7	1.5
10,000 or more	2.9	3.2	2.4	1.1	2.2	1.8	2.3	3.3	1.1	1.0	2.9	†	1.9	3.2	1.8
Community type															
City	4.2	5.5	4.7	2.5	4.3	4.0	2.6	4.9	3.3	2.4	4.4	†	3.9	4.3	2.9
Suburban	3.0	3.4	2.8	3.0	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.8	1.7	2.4	2.8	1.3	2.8	4.0	2.0
Town	3.9	4.4	4.2	2.3	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.3	†	3.2	3.1	†	2.8	4.3	1.5
Rural	3.2	3.4	2.9	2.1	3.3	3.3	2.7	3.3	1.4	2.6	2.7	†	3.1	3.9	1.8
Region															
Northeast	2.4	4.2	3.4	3.7	4.4	3.8	4.3	6.7	2.5	3.7	3.9	†	4.3	5.5	1.7
Southeast	4.4	5.9	5.8	3.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.9	†	3.3	3.6	†	4.3	4.3	3.6
Central	3.0	3.4	2.9	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.5	1.3	2.4	3.4	†	3.3	4.3	1.6
West	3.6	4.9	3.4	2.7	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.5	†	3.0	3.7	†	4.2	5.2	2.9
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	3.3	3.0	2.0	2.8	3.9	3.5	3.4	4.1	1.4	3.0	3.3	†	2.9	4.0	1.5
10 to 19 percent	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.5	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.2	1.1	2.2	3.2	†	3.1	4.0	1.7
20 percent or more	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.6	1.5	2.8	3.6	1.3	4.2	5.0	2.8

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 4a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts where information is regularly provided to receiving schools about the unique needs of individual at-risk students when the student transitions to a school at a higher instructional level, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Information provided to receiving school
All public school districts	1.3
District enrollment size	
Less than 2,500	1.7
2,500 to 9,999	1.1
10,000 or more	2.2
Community type	
City	2.8
Suburban	2.3
Town	2.4
Rural	2.0
Region	
Northeast	3.9
Southeast	2.5
Central	1.9
West	2.7
Poverty concentration	
Less than 10 percent	2.8
10 to 19 percent	1.6
20 percent or more	2.1

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 5a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using various transition supports for all students in any of the district’s schools to help students transition between instructional levels, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Transition from elementary to middle/junior high school			Transition from middle/junior high school to high school		
	Assign a student mentor	Assign an adult mentor	Offer an advisement class	Assign a student mentor	Assign an adult mentor	Offer an advisement class
All public school districts	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.8
District enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	1.5	1.7	2.2	1.8	2.5	2.4
2,500 to 9,999	1.2	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.4
10,000 or more	2.1	2.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.0
Community type						
City	3.5	2.5	3.8	4.3	3.5	4.4
Suburban	2.0	2.2	2.5	3.1	2.7	3.0
Town	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.4	4.0
Rural	1.6	2.1	2.5	2.2	2.5	3.0
Region						
Northeast	2.1	2.4	3.9	2.8	4.1	3.8
Southeast	1.8	3.0	3.3	2.2	3.7	4.2
Central	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.8	3.3	3.2
West	2.1	2.4	3.0	3.0	3.3	4.2
Poverty concentration						
Less than 10 percent	2.0	2.2	2.5	3.2	3.2	3.5
10 to 19 percent	1.9	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.7	2.6
20 percent or more	1.8	2.4	2.8	2.6	3.1	3.8

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 6a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using various types of mentors in any of their schools specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by instructional level of the school in which mentors are used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Student mentors			School counselors, teachers, or school administrators who formally mentor students			Adult employed by the district whose only job is to mentor students			Community volunteers		
	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school	Offered in elementary school	Offered in middle/junior high school	Offered in high school
All public school districts	1.6	1.7	2.1	1.6	1.5	1.6	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.5
District enrollment size												
Less than 2,500	2.1	2.4	3.0	2.2	1.9	2.2	1.3	1.4	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.0
2,500 to 9,999	2.4	1.8	2.2	1.7	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.3	1.4	2.8	2.6	2.6
10,000 or more	3.6	3.4	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2	1.8	1.9	2.4	2.7	3.0	2.8
Community type												
City	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.0	3.9	3.9	2.6	3.0	3.5	4.4	4.1	4.5
Suburban	2.3	2.6	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.8	1.5	1.5	1.7	2.2	2.0	2.9
Town	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.6	2.0	2.3	2.8	3.9	3.6	3.3
Rural	2.2	2.5	3.1	2.6	2.4	2.4	1.4	1.6	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.2
Region												
Northeast	3.7	3.1	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.4	1.7	2.3	2.4	3.2	2.8	3.0
Southeast	3.8	3.1	2.9	4.3	3.9	3.8	1.9	1.9	2.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
Central	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.6	1.6	1.8	1.8	2.7	2.5	2.5
West	2.6	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.0	1.8	2.0	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.4
Poverty concentration												
Less than 10 percent	2.7	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.2	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.6	2.8	3.3
10 to 19 percent	2.8	2.4	3.2	3.0	2.7	2.1	1.0	1.6	1.8	2.4	2.2	2.1
20 percent or more	2.3	2.6	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.5	2.1	2.2	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.6

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 7a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts using a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems in schools or classrooms, by instructional level of the school in which it is used and district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Use a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems		
	Elementary schools	Middle/junior high schools	High school
All public school districts	1.6	1.7	1.5
District enrollment size			
Less than 2,500	2.2	2.4	2.1
2,500 to 9,999	1.8	2.0	1.9
10,000 or more	1.5	1.6	2.6
Community type			
City	2.6	3.6	3.8
Suburban	2.9	3.1	3.5
Town	3.0	3.6	3.4
Rural	2.7	3.0	2.3
Region			
Northeast	3.7	4.2	4.1
Southeast	4.0	4.1	4.1
Central	2.9	3.2	2.8
West	3.7	3.4	3.6
Poverty concentration			
Less than 10 percent	2.7	2.8	3.4
10 to 19 percent	2.9	3.0	2.7
20 percent or more	3.4	3.2	2.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 8a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Truancy or excessive absences			Academic failure			Failure on state standardized tests			Behaviors that warrant suspension or expulsion			Behaviors that warrant other disciplinary action		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	1.1	1.7	1.9	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.4
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	1.6	2.2	2.6	1.6	1.6	2.1	2.0	2.3	1.8	1.9	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	1.9
2,500 to 9,999	0.8	1.9	2.1	0.6	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.9	2.3	1.1	2.4	2.1	1.8	2.2	1.9
10,000 or more	1.2	2.2	2.2	†	1.4	1.3	2.1	2.7	2.3	1.4	1.9	2.5	2.0	2.2	2.2
Community type															
City	1.4	3.6	3.8	1.4	2.5	2.8	2.6	4.2	4.3	2.0	4.0	4.2	3.2	4.2	3.8
Suburban	2.2	2.4	3.4	2.1	2.0	2.9	2.5	3.2	3.4	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.2
Town	2.0	2.9	3.8	†	2.5	2.7	3.5	4.1	3.3	2.2	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.4
Rural	2.1	2.4	2.8	2.1	1.7	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.3
Region															
Northeast	3.1	3.7	4.3	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.7
Southeast	†	3.2	3.3	†	2.9	3.0	3.3	4.3	4.2	1.9	4.2	4.1	3.2	4.3	4.1
Central	1.9	3.4	3.5	1.8	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.8	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.3	2.6
West	2.3	2.9	3.5	2.3	2.9	3.0	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	2.5
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	2.8	3.0	3.4	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.6	3.3	2.7
10 to 19 percent	1.7	2.4	2.8	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.5	3.0	2.3	2.1	2.6	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.3
20 percent or more	2.4	3.0	3.6	2.2	2.8	3.4	2.9	2.7	3.3	2.6	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	2.3

See notes at end of table.

Table 8a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Involvement with the criminal justice system			Involvement with social services or foster care			Pregnancy/teen parenthood			Substance abuse			Learning disability			Mental health problems		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.0	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.9	1.3
District enrollment size																		
Less than 2,500	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.5	1.5	2.4	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.6	2.0	2.3	1.9	1.6	2.7	2.6	1.7
2,500 to 9,999	1.5	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.8	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.5	2.3	1.7	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.2	1.6
10,000 or more	1.7	2.1	2.6	3.2	3.7	3.2	2.5	2.8	3.2	2.7	3.1	3.7	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.6	2.9
Community type																		
City	2.8	3.5	3.9	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.9	4.1	3.4	4.3	3.6	3.2	4.1	4.0
Suburban	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.0	1.9	2.9	2.4	2.7	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.2	2.3
Town	2.9	3.9	4.2	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.9	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.5	4.2	2.7
Rural	2.8	2.3	2.6	3.3	2.9	1.6	3.2	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.8	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.1
Region																		
Northeast	4.0	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.6	2.8	4.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.7	4.1	4.1	3.1	4.1	3.8	2.3
Southeast	3.2	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.0	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.5	3.4
Central	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.2	3.4	2.9	2.7	3.3	3.4	2.5	3.6	2.7	2.7	3.8	3.7	2.1
West	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4	2.1	3.7	3.2	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.1	3.1	2.4	3.3	3.1	2.6
Poverty concentration																		
Less than 10 percent	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.0	2.2	3.3	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.7	3.5	3.1	2.3	3.7	3.5	2.1
10 to 19 percent	2.6	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.5	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.3	2.4	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.3	3.1	2.8	2.4
20 percent or more	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.6	3.6	2.0	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.5	3.6	2.8	3.2	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.0	2.4

See notes at end of table.

Table 8a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting the extent to which various factors are used in their district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11—Continued

District characteristic	Observed change in student attitude or life conditions			Homelessness or frequent address change			Limited English proficiency			Migrant status			Other		
	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent	Not at all or small extent	Mod-erate extent	Large extent
All public school districts	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.5	1.1	0.4	0.3	0.3
District enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.3	1.6	2.1	2.1	1.4	0.5	†	†
2,500 to 9,999	1.9	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.2	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.5	0.7
10,000 or more	1.5	3.9	3.6	1.7	2.5	3.1	2.4	2.4	2.5	3.1	2.5	3.0	1.3	0.9	0.9
Community type															
City	3.4	4.3	3.7	2.9	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.2	4.2	4.0	1.9	1.5	1.3	0.9
Suburban	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.6	3.2	2.8	2.2	2.4	2.0	1.7	0.7	†	0.6
Town	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.0	3.1	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.1	3.4	2.9	2.2	1.1	†	†
Rural	2.5	2.6	2.3	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	1.6	2.5	2.4	1.6	0.6	†	†
Region															
Northeast	3.5	4.1	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.1	3.1	2.7	1.9	1.5	1.2	†
Southeast	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.6	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.8	2.9	4.0	3.7	2.7	0.8	†	0.6
Central	3.0	3.4	2.7	3.5	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.1	1.7	3.3	3.0	1.7	0.2	†	†
West	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.2	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.1	0.7	†	0.7
Poverty concentration															
Less than 10 percent	3.2	3.3	2.6	3.4	3.4	2.5	2.9	2.6	1.6	2.7	2.5	1.5	0.6	0.3	0.5
10 to 19 percent	2.4	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.6	1.7	0.8	0.6	0.6
20 percent or more	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.2	3.1	2.8	2.0	0.6	†	†

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 9a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they work with various entities to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Child protective services	Community mental health agency	State or local government agencies that provide financial assistance to needy families	Churches or community organizations	Crisis intervention center	Juvenile assessment center	Local business	Drug and/or alcohol clinic	Health clinic or hospital	Family planning/child placement agency	Child care centers/providers for children of teen parents	Job placement center
All public school districts	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6
District enrollment size												
Less than 2,500	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1
2,500 to 9,999	1.4	1.4	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.3
10,000 or more	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.6	2.1	2.7	2.0	1.5	2.2	2.8	3.7	2.3
Community type												
City	2.0	2.6	2.5	3.3	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.2	3.7	4.0	4.0
Suburban	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.6
Town	2.3	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.6	4.1	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.4
Rural	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.4	2.2
Region												
Northeast	2.4	2.6	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
Southeast	3.0	2.8	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.9
Central	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.1	3.4	2.5	2.3	2.9	2.9	2.4
West	2.6	3.5	3.6	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.6	2.5	3.8	2.6	2.3	2.3
Poverty concentration												
Less than 10 percent	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.2	2.7	3.1
10 to 19 percent	2.2	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.2	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.3
20 percent or more	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.6	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.0	2.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 10a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out and the percent of public school districts reporting that they provide information about various education and training options to students who appear highly likely to drop out, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Employment or financial consequences of dropping out		Education and training options							
			Alternative schools or programs		Job training/GED combination programs		GED or adult education programs		Job training programs	
	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students	Yes, standard procedure with all students	Yes, with some students
All public school districts	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.2	2.0	1.5	2.1	1.5	1.6	1.7
District enrollment size										
Less than 2,500	2.4	2.3	1.9	1.7	2.8	2.0	2.9	2.1	2.2	2.2
2,500 to 9,999	2.2	2.4	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.5	1.8	2.1	2.0	2.8
10,000 or more	2.8	3.0	1.7	1.6	3.5	3.2	3.1	2.6	2.7	3.1
Community type										
City	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.5	4.4	3.8	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.2
Suburban	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.9
Town	4.2	3.2	3.1	2.7	3.9	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.7	3.5
Rural	2.5	2.7	2.2	1.9	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.2	2.4	2.3
Region										
Northeast	4.6	3.4	3.5	2.5	3.7	2.8	3.7	2.8	3.5	3.4
Southeast	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.5	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.5
Central	2.6	2.2	3.0	2.3	2.8	2.6	3.2	2.7	2.7	3.2
West	3.6	3.6	3.1	2.5	3.4	2.6	3.8	3.0	3.0	2.8
Poverty concentration										
Less than 10 percent	3.6	2.9	3.0	2.5	3.4	2.4	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.9
10 to 19 percent	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.4
20 percent or more	3.4	3.4	3.7	2.8	4.5	3.3	4.4	3.0	3.7	3.3

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "Dropout Prevention Services and Programs," FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 11a. Standard errors for the percentage distribution of public school districts reporting whether the district tries to determine the status of students who do not return to school in the fall as expected, and the standard errors for the percentage distribution reporting whether the district follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	District tries to determine status of students who do not return in the fall as expected			District follows up with students who dropped out before the next school year to encourage them to return		
	Yes, for all students	Yes, with some students	No	Yes, for all students	Yes, with some students	No
All public school districts	1.5	1.1	1.2	2.0	1.8	1.5
District enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	2.0	1.5	1.6	2.7	2.5	2.0
2,500 to 9,999	1.7	1.3	1.2	2.3	1.8	2.0
10,000 or more	2.7	2.8	1.3	2.4	2.6	1.7
Community type						
City	3.3	2.8	2.5	3.8	4.2	3.3
Suburban	3.2	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.8	3.1
Town	3.0	2.7	2.0	4.1	3.2	3.3
Rural	2.2	1.6	1.9	2.9	2.5	2.3
Region						
Northeast	4.0	2.6	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.6
Southeast	3.8	3.3	2.2	4.3	4.0	3.0
Central	2.4	1.9	2.0	3.1	2.9	3.0
West	2.8	2.4	2.4	3.4	3.0	2.9
Poverty concentration						
Less than 10 percent	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.9	2.2	2.4
10 to 19 percent	2.3	2.1	1.4	3.5	3.2	2.9
20 percent or more	3.5	3.0	2.4	3.1	3.1	2.8

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Table 12a. Standard errors for the percent of public school districts reporting that they use various types of information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts, by district characteristics: School year 2010–11

District characteristic	Dropout rates	Graduation rates	Number of students attending adult education/ GED programs	Number of students taking or passing the GED test	Attendance rates	Number or percentage of students failing courses or held back	Number of expulsions or other disciplinary actions	State standardized test scores	Feedback from a district-administered parent or student survey	Other
All public school districts	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.9	1.8	1.6	0.3
District enrollment size										
Less than 2,500	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.0	1.8	2.6	2.5	2.1	†
2,500 to 9,999	1.5	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.4	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.2	0.7
10,000 or more	2.0	1.4	2.3	2.8	1.3	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.5
Community type										
City	2.8	2.7	3.7	3.5	2.5	3.1	3.0	2.6	3.8	2.3
Suburban	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.3	3.2	0.4
Town	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.4	2.9	2.9	4.0	3.2	3.8	†
Rural	2.1	2.3	2.9	2.8	2.2	2.0	2.7	2.9	2.5	0.3
Region										
Northeast	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.2	3.1	4.0	4.4	3.7	0.7
Southeast	2.0	2.2	4.1	4.0	2.6	3.1	3.4	3.6	4.3	0.8
Central	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.9	3.1	2.8	†
West	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.4	0.5
Poverty concentration										
Less than 10 percent	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.6	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.0	0.8
10 to 19 percent	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.9	0.3
20 percent or more	2.5	2.5	2.9	2.7	2.2	3.0	3.4	3.0	3.7	0.6

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B

Technical Notes

This page intentionally left blank.

Technical Notes

Fast Response Survey System

The Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) was established in 1975 by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), U.S. Department of Education. FRSS is designed to collect issue-oriented data within a relatively short time frame. FRSS collects data from state education agencies, local education agencies, public and private elementary and secondary schools, public school teachers, and public libraries. To ensure minimal burden on respondents, the surveys are generally limited to three pages of questions, with a response burden of about 30 minutes per respondent. Sample sizes are relatively small (usually about 1,200 to 1,800 respondents per survey) so that data collection can be completed quickly. Data are weighted to produce national estimates of the sampled education sector. The sample size permits limited breakouts by analysis variables. However, as the number of categories within any single analysis variable increases, the sample size within categories decreases, which results in larger sampling errors for the breakouts by analysis variables.

Sample Design

The sample for the FRSS survey of *Dropout Prevention Services and Programs* consisted of 1,200 public school districts in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The nationally representative sample was selected from the 2008–09 NCES Common Core of Data (CCD) Local Education Agency (School District) Universe file, which was the most current file available at the time of selection. The sampling frame included 13,563 regular public school districts. For purposes of this study, “regular” school districts included any local school district that was not a component of a supervisory union (i.e., Education Agency type 1 on the CCD) or was a local school district component of a supervisory union sharing a superintendent and administrative services with other local school districts (i.e., Education Agency type 2 on the CCD). Excluded from the sampling frame were districts in the outlying U.S. territories and districts with no enrollments or missing enrollments.

The school district sampling frame was stratified by the instructional level of the schools operated by the district and enrollment size class. Information about instructional level of the schools in the district was obtained from the 2008-09 CCD public school universe file. Elementary districts were those with only elementary schools, while unified/secondary districts included at least one secondary school. Within the two categories of instructional level, the sample was allocated to size strata in rough proportion to the aggregate square root of the enrollment in the stratum. Districts in the sampling frame were then sorted by community type³ and region to induce additional implicit stratification. Within each primary stratum, districts were selected systematically and with equal probabilities.

Data Collection and Response Rates

Questionnaires and cover letters were mailed to the superintendent of each sampled school district in September 2010. The letter introduced the study and requested that the questionnaire be completed by the person most knowledgeable about dropout prevention services and programs in the district. Respondents were offered the option of completing the survey via the Web. Telephone follow-up for survey nonresponse and data clarification was initiated in October 2010 and completed in January 2011.

³ The community type variable is based on the urban-centric district locale variable from the 2008-09 CCD (ULOCAL08), discussed further in the Definitions of Analysis Variables section of this report.

Of the 1,200 districts in the sample, 5 districts were found to be ineligible for the survey because they were administrative entities only that did not operate any schools. This left a total of 1,195 eligible districts in the sample. Completed questionnaires were received from 1,086 districts, or 91 percent of the eligible districts (table B-1). Of the districts that completed the survey, 61 percent completed it via the Web, 27 percent completed it by mail, 7 percent completed it by fax or email, and 5 percent completed it by telephone. The weighted response rate using the initial base weights was 89 percent. The weighted number of eligible districts in the survey represents the estimated universe of public school districts in the 50 states and the District of Columbia with one or more regular schools.⁴

Table B-1. Number and percent of responding public school districts in the study sample, and estimated number and percent of public school districts the sample represents, by selected district characteristics: School year 2010–11

Selected characteristic	Respondent sample (unweighted)		National estimate (weighted)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All public school districts	1,086	100	13,400	100
District enrollment size				
Less than 2,500	442	41	9,400	71
2,500 to 9,999	395	36	3,000	23
10,000 or more	249	23	900	7
Community type				
City	154	14	700	5
Suburban	318	29	2,600	20
Town	206	19	2,400	18
Rural	408	38	7,600	57
Region				
Northeast	223	21	2,900	21
Southeast	202	19	1,500	12
Central	326	30	4,800	36
West	335	31	4,100	31
Poverty concentration				
Less than 10 percent	335	31	4,000	30
10 to 19 percent	442	41	5,500	41
20 percent or more	309	28	3,900	29

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), “Dropout Prevention Services and Programs,” FRSS 99, 2010.

Imputation for Item Nonresponse

Although item nonresponse items was very low (less than 1 percent for any item), missing data were imputed for the items with a response rate of less than 100 percent.⁵ The missing items were all categorical data, such as whether districts work with churches or community organizations to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out. The missing data were imputed using a “hot-deck” approach to obtain a “donor” district from which the imputed values were derived. Under the hot-deck approach, a donor district that matched selected characteristics of the district with missing data (the recipient district) was identified. The matching characteristics included community type, geographic region, district enrollment size, and high and low grades offered in the district. In addition, relevant questionnaire items were used to form appropriate imputation

⁴ For more details about the development of survey weights, see the section of this report on Sampling Errors.

⁵ Per NCES standard 4-1-2, all missing questionnaire data are imputed (all items are considered key data items for this survey).

groupings. Once a donor was found, it was used to obtain the imputed values for the district with missing data. The imputed values were the corresponding value from the donor district.

Data Reliability

Although the district survey on dropout prevention services and programs was designed to account for sampling error and to minimize nonsampling error, estimates produced from the data collected are subject to both types of error. Sampling error occurs because the data are collected from a sample rather than a census of the population, and nonsampling errors are errors made during the collection and processing of the data.

Sampling Errors

The responses were weighted to produce national estimates (table B-1). The weights were designed to reflect the variable probabilities of selection of the sampled districts and were adjusted for differential unit (questionnaire) nonresponse. The nonresponse weighting adjustments were made within classes defined by variables used in sampling and expected to be correlated with response propensity: district level (i.e., elementary or unified/secondary), district size class, community type, and region. Within the final weighting classes, the base weights (i.e., the reciprocal of districts' probabilities of selection) of the responding districts were inflated by the inverse of the weighted response rate for the class. The findings in this report are estimates based on the sample selected and, consequently, are subject to sampling variability. Jackknife replication was used to estimate the sampling variability of the estimates and to test for statistically significant differences between estimates.

The standard error is a measure of the variability of an estimate due to sampling. It indicates the variability of a sample estimate that would be obtained from all possible samples of a given design and size. Standard errors are used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below to 1.96 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the true population parameter being estimated in about 95 percent of the samples. This is a 95 percent confidence interval. For example, the estimated percent of districts with high school grades that offered credit recovery courses/programs to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out is 87.6 percent, and the standard error is 1.33 percent (tables 2 and 2a). The 95 percent confidence interval for the statistic extends from $[87.6 - (1.33 \times 1.96)]$ to $[87.6 + (1.33 \times 1.96)]$, or from 85.0 to 90.2 percent. The 1.96 is the critical value for a two-sided statistical test at the 0.05 significance level (where 0.05 indicates the 5 percent of all possible samples that would be outside the range of the confidence interval).

Because the data from the FRSS district survey on dropout prevention services and programs were collected using a complex sampling design, the variances of the estimates from this survey (e.g., estimates of proportions) are typically different from what would be expected from data collected with a simple random sample. Not taking the complex sample design into account can lead to an underestimation or overestimation of the standard errors associated with such estimates. To generate accurate standard errors for the estimates in this report, standard errors were computed using a technique known as jackknife replication. As with any replication method, jackknife replication involves constructing a number of subsamples (replicates) from the full sample and computing the statistic of interest for each replicate. The mean square error of the replicate estimates around the full sample estimate provides an estimate of the variance of the statistic. To construct the replications, 100 stratified subsamples of the full sample were created and then dropped one at a time to define 100 jackknife replicates. A computer program (WesVar) was used to calculate the estimates of standard errors.⁶

⁶ The WesVar program and documentation is available for download at http://www.westat.com/Westat/expertise/information_systems/WesVar/index.cfm.

All specific statements of comparisons made in this report have been tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using Student's *t*-statistic to ensure that the differences are larger than those that might be expected due to sampling variation. Adjustments for multiple comparisons were not included. Student's *t* values were computed to test the difference between estimates with the following formula:

$$t = \frac{E_1 - E_2}{\sqrt{se_1^2 + se_2^2}}$$

where E_1 and E_2 are the estimates to be compared and se_1 and se_2 are their corresponding standard errors. Many of the variables examined are related to one another, and complex interactions and relationships have not been explored.

Nonsampling Errors

Nonsampling error is the term used to describe variations in the estimates that may be caused by population coverage limitations and data collection, processing, and reporting procedures. The sources of nonsampling errors are typically problems like unit and item nonresponse, differences in respondents' interpretations of the meaning of questions, response differences related to the particular time the survey was conducted, and mistakes made during data preparation. It is difficult to identify and estimate either the amount of nonsampling error or the bias caused by this error. To minimize the potential for nonsampling error, this study used a variety of procedures, including a pretest of the questionnaire with school district respondents. The pretest provided the opportunity to check for consistency of interpretation of questions and definitions and to eliminate ambiguous items. The questionnaire and instructions were also extensively reviewed by NCES. In addition, manual and machine editing of the questionnaire responses were conducted to check the data for accuracy and consistency. Cases with missing or inconsistent items were recontacted by telephone to resolve problems. Data were keyed with 100 percent verification for surveys received by mail, fax, or telephone.

Definitions of Analysis Variables

Many of the district characteristics, described below, may be related to each other. For example, district enrollment size and community type are related, with city districts typically being larger than rural districts. Other relationships between these analysis variables may exist. However, this *First Look* report focuses on national estimates and bivariate relationships between the analysis variables and questionnaire variables rather than more complex analyses.

District Enrollment Size—This variable indicates the total number of students enrolled in the district based on data from the 2008–09 CCD Local Education Agency Universe file. The variable was collapsed into the three categories below. These institution size categories are standard for FRSS district surveys and reflect size categories used to determine an approximately optimum allocation of the sample for robust statistical reporting.

Less than 2,500 students

2,500 to 9,999 students

10,000 or more students

Community Type—A created variable collapsed from the 12-category urban-centric district locale code (ULOCAL) that was assigned using the 2000 Decennial Census data. Data were obtained from the 2008–09 CCD Local Education Agency Universe file. The data were collapsed into four categories:

City—Includes large, midsize, and small principal cities

Suburban—Includes large, midsize, and small urbanized territories outside principal cities

Town—Includes fringe, distant, and remote territories that are inside an urban cluster

Rural—Includes fringe, distant, and remote territories that are outside of urbanized areas and urban clusters

Region—This variable classifies districts into one of the four geographic regions used by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Data were obtained from the 2008–09 CCD Local Education Agency Universe file. The geographic regions are as follows:

Northeast—Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont

Southeast—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

Central—Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin

West—Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming

Poverty Concentration—This variable indicates the percentage of children in the district ages 5–17 in families living below the poverty level, based on the Title I data provided to the U.S. Department of Education by the U.S. Census Bureau, “Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates.” For detailed information on the methodology used to create these estimates, please refer to <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saie/index.html>.

The variable was collapsed into the three categories below. These poverty concentration categories are standard for FRSS district surveys and reflect size categories used to determine an approximately optimum allocation of the sample for robust statistical reporting.

Less than 10 percent

10 to 19 percent

20 percent or more

Grades Taught in the District—Many of the tables in this report are subset by the grade levels taught in the sampled school districts. Data on the low and high grades taught in the district were obtained from the 2008–09 CCD Local Education Agency Universe file (GSLO08 and GSHI08), and updated based on information received from districts during data collection. Based on the low and high grades taught in the district, districts were counted as having elementary school grades if they taught grade 5 or below, regardless of whether they also taught higher grades; middle/junior high school grades if they taught grades 7 or 8, regardless of the other grades taught in the district; and high school grades if they taught grades 9 or above, regardless of whether they also taught lower grades. Using these definitions, 96 percent of the districts were counted as having elementary school grades, 93 percent were counted as having middle/junior high school grades, and 81 percent were counted as having high school grades.

Instructional Level—In survey questions that asked respondents to report by instructional level, the grade ranges of elementary school, middle/junior high, and high school were not defined for district respondents.

Definitions of Terms Used in This Report

The following is the exact wording of the definitions that were included on the questionnaire.

An **advisement class** is one that is held regularly (e.g., weekly) and may include lessons on organizational and study skills, information on courses needed for graduation, and information about careers and college preparation.

Alternative schools and programs are designed to address the needs of students that typically cannot be met in regular schools. The students who attend alternative schools and programs are typically at risk of educational failure (as indicated by poor grades, truancy, disruptive behavior, pregnancy, or similar factors associated with temporary or permanent withdrawal from school).

Career/technical high schools are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, technical, or professional occupations. For purposes of this survey, please include career/technical high schools that are available to students in your district and are administered either by your district or by a regional entity.

Credit recovery courses/programs are opportunities allowing students to recover course credits from classes they have missed or failed.

Decelerated curriculum refers to a curriculum that is spread over a longer period of time than a regular course. An example of a decelerated curriculum is an algebra 1 course that is spread over 2 years or two class periods for an entire year. This definition applies to any curriculum that is decelerated specifically to meet the needs of students who may be at risk of failing a course.

Electronic warning system is an electronic database used to identify students who may be at risk of dropping out. The system includes multiple pieces of student information, such as attendance, grades, and behavioral referrals, one or more of which may be used to identify at-risk students.

Formal program to reduce behavioral problems refers to a systematic program that is specifically designed to reduce behavioral problems and is implemented at the classroom or school level.

Guided study hall/academic support period is typically for students who are struggling academically; teachers assist students by helping them manage their time and their assignments, and either provide or get them the academic support/tutoring that they need to complete homework and be successful in their classes. Teachers may also provide academic support in specific academic areas such as math, reading, or social studies.

Students who are **highly likely to drop out of school** may include those with multiple risk factors, such as many unexcused absences, academic failure, or reoccurring behavior that warrants suspension or expulsion, or those who provide other strong indications that they are dropping out.

Job training and GED combination programs are programs that combine both job training and GED preparation courses. This includes programs such as Job Corps or the Army/National Guard GED program or other similar programs.

Job training programs are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, or technical occupations. These programs do not include GED preparation or result in a high school diploma.

Juvenile assessment center is a centralized receiving, processing, and intervention facility that brings together community services for youth and families who have, or are likely to have, contact with the legal system.

A **remediation class** is any class intended to bring students who are academically below grade level up to proficiency.

Self-paced courses/independent study are opportunities for students to work through a course at their own pace, for example, through a computer-based program or packets of work.

Summer bridge programs are programs designed to provide assistance to students before transitioning from one instructional level school to another (e.g., from middle school to high school). These programs may include, but are not limited to, providing academic support, remedial opportunities, study skills, and opportunities to connect to teachers or peers at the new school.

Contact Information

For more information about the survey, contact Jared Coopersmith, Early Childhood, International, and Crosscutting Studies Division, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006, e-mail: jared.coopersmith@ed.gov; telephone: (202) 219-7106.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix C

Questionnaire

This page intentionally left blank.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-5651

DROPOUT PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

FAST RESPONSE SURVEY SYSTEM

FORM APPROVED
O.M.B. No.: 1850-0733
EXPIRATION DATE: 06/2012

This survey is authorized by law (Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, 20 U.S.C. 9543). While participation in this survey is voluntary, your cooperation is critical to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely. Your answers may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose unless otherwise compelled by law (Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, 20 U.S.C. 9573).

This survey focuses on dropout prevention services and programs in your district. By dropout prevention services and programs, we mean those that are intended to increase the rate at which students are staying in school, progressing toward graduation, or earning a high school credential.

Please answer the survey about dropout prevention services or programs offered by your district or by any of the schools in your district in the current 2010-11 school year.

The survey is designed to be completed by the person or persons most knowledgeable about dropout prevention services and programs in your school district. Please consult with others who can help provide the requested information.

IF ABOVE DISTRICT INFORMATION IS INCORRECT, PLEASE UPDATE DIRECTLY ON LABEL.

Name of person completing this form: _____

Title/position: _____

Telephone number: _____ E-mail: _____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

THANK YOU.

PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THE SURVEY FOR YOUR RECORDS.

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED FORM TO:

Mail: Priscilla Carver (8599.01.05.03)
Westat
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3195
Fax: 800-254-0984

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, CONTACT:

Priscilla Carver at Westat
800-937-8281, Ext. 4596 or 301-279-4596
E-mail: dropoutsurvey@westat.com

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0733. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 20 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have any comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006.

FRSS 99, 09/2010

Instructions and Definitions Page

Please answer the survey about dropout prevention services or programs offered by your district or by any of the schools in your district in the current 2010–11 school year.

Dropout prevention services or programs are those that are intended to increase the rate at which students are staying in school, progressing toward graduation, or earning a high school credential.

An **advisement class** is one that is held regularly (e.g., weekly) and may include lessons on organizational and study skills, information on courses needed for graduation, and information about careers and college preparation.

Alternative schools and programs are designed to address the needs of students that typically cannot be met in regular schools. The students who attend alternative schools and programs are typically at risk of educational failure (as indicated by poor grades, truancy, disruptive behavior, pregnancy, or similar factors associated with temporary or permanent withdrawal from school).

Career/technical high schools are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, technical, or professional occupations. For purposes of this survey, please include career/technical high schools that are available to students in your district and are administered either by your district or by a regional entity.

Credit recovery courses/programs are opportunities allowing students to recover course credits from classes they have missed or failed.

Decelerated curriculum refers to a curriculum that is spread over a longer period of time than a regular course. An example of a decelerated curriculum is an algebra 1 course that is spread over 2 years or two class periods for an entire year. This definition applies to any curriculum that is decelerated specifically to meet the needs of students who may be at risk of failing a course.

Electronic warning system is an electronic database used to identify students who may be at risk of dropping out. The system includes multiple pieces of student information, such as attendance, grades, and behavioral referrals, one or more of which may be used to identify at-risk students.

Formal program to reduce behavioral problems refers to a systematic program that is specifically designed to reduce behavioral problems and is implemented at the classroom or school level.

Guided study hall/academic support period is typically for students who are struggling academically; teachers assist students by helping them manage their time and their assignments, and either provide or get them the academic support/tutoring that they need to complete homework and be successful in their classes. Teachers may also provide academic support in specific academic areas such as math, reading, or social studies.

Students who are **highly likely to drop out of school** may include those with multiple risk factors, such as many unexcused absences, academic failure, or reoccurring behavior that warrants suspension or expulsion, or those who provide other strong indications that they are dropping out.

Job training and GED combination programs are programs that combine both job training and GED preparation courses. This includes programs such as Job Corps or the Army/National Guard GED program or other similar programs.

Job training programs are those that provide formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, or technical occupations. These programs do not include GED preparation or result in a high school diploma.

Juvenile Assessment Center is a centralized receiving, processing, and intervention facility that brings together community services for youth and families who have, or are likely to have, contact with the legal system.

A **remediation class** is any class intended to bring students who are academically below grade level up to proficiency.

Self-paced courses/independent study are opportunities for students to work through a course at their own pace, for example, through a computer-based program or packets of work.

Summer bridge programs are programs designed to provide assistance to students before transitioning from one instructional level school to another (e.g., from middle school to high school). These programs may include, but are not limited to, providing academic support, remedial opportunities, study skills, and opportunities to connect to teachers or peers at the new school.

**Definitions are provided on the instructions and definitions page
for all items marked with an asterisk (*).**

1. Are any of the following services or programs offered **specifically** to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school in **any** of the schools in your district? *(Circle one on each line for each instructional level.)*

Service/program	Instructional levels					
	Elementary school		Middle/junior high school		High school	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Tutoring	1	2	1	2	1	2
b. Summer school to prevent grade retention	1	2	1	2	1	2
c. *Remediation classes	1	2	1	2	1	2
d. *Guided study hall/academic support period	1	2	1	2	1	2
e. *Alternative schools or programs	1	2	1	2	1	2
f. After-school programs specifically to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out.....	1	2	1	2	1	2

2. Are any of the following services or programs offered **specifically** to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out of school in **any** of the schools in your district? *(Circle one on each line.)*

	Yes	No
a. District-administered General Education Development (GED) preparation courses	1	2
b. Early graduation options for earning a regular diploma	1	2
c. *Decelerated curriculum for any course (e.g., algebra 1 extended over 2 years or 2 class periods) .	1	2
d. *Credit recovery courses/programs	1	2
e. *Self-paced courses (e.g., computer or packet based) for purposes other than credit recovery	1	2
f. Smaller class size	1	2
g. Flexible school day (e.g., shortened school day, evening classes, or Saturday classes)	1	2
h. *Summer bridge program	1	2

3. Please indicate in **part 1** whether the following educational options are available to students in your district. For each option you mark as available, please indicate in **part 2** how many students at risk of dropping out participate.

Educational option	1. Available in your district?		2. If available, how many students at risk of dropping out participate?		
			No or few at-risk students participate	Some at-risk students participate	Most at-risk students participate
	Yes	No			
a. *Career/technical high school (including regional career/technical high schools)	1	2	1	2	3
b. Career/technical courses at a regular high school	1	2	1	2	3
c. Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with a career/technical focus	1	2	1	2	3
d. Dual enrollment in postsecondary courses with an academic focus (e.g., English, math, foreign languages) .	1	2	1	2	3
e. Work-based learning (e.g., internships/apprenticeships) ..	1	2	1	2	3

4. Does your district provide or subsidize child care while teen parents are attending classes? *(Circle one.)*

Yes 1 No 2

5. When a student who is at risk of dropping out is transitioning from a school at one instructional level to a school at a higher instructional level (e.g., from middle school to high school), is information regularly provided to the receiving school about the unique needs of that student? *(Circle one.)*

Yes 1 No 2

6. Are the following supports used in **any** of the schools in your district to help students transition from a school of one instructional level to a school at a higher instructional level (e.g., from middle school to high school)? (Circle one on each line for each transition.)

Transition support for all students	Transition			
	Elementary to middle/junior high school		Middle/junior high school to high school	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Assign all students a student mentor upon entry into the new school	1	2	1	2
b. Assign all students an adult mentor upon entry into the new school	1	2	1	2
c. Offer an advisement class* for all students during the first year at the new school	1	2	1	2

7. Are any of the following types of mentors used in **any** of the schools in your district **specifically** to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out? (Circle one on each line for each instructional level.)

Mentor	Instructional levels					
	Elementary school		Middle/junior high school		High school	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Student mentors	1	2	1	2	1	2
b. School counselors, teachers, or school administrators who formally mentor students	1	2	1	2	1	2
c. Adult mentors employed by the district whose only job is to mentor students	1	2	1	2	1	2
d. Community volunteers (i.e., volunteers from churches, community organizations, businesses, etc.)	1	2	1	2	1	2

8. Do **any** of the schools in your district use a formal program designed to reduce behavioral problems* in schools or classrooms (e.g., Positive Behavioral Support, Positive Behavioral Intervention System, etc.)? (Circle one for each instructional level.)

	Yes	No
a. Elementary school	1	2
b. Middle/junior high school	1	2
c. High school	1	2

9. Does your district have a standardized method of identifying students who may be at risk of dropping out (e.g., a standardized checklist of at-risk behaviors or an electronic warning system*)? (Circle one.)

Yes 1 No 2

10. To what extent are the following factors used in your district to identify students who are at risk of dropping out? (Circle one on each line.)

Factor	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Large extent
a. Truancy or excessive absences	1	2	3	4
b. Academic failure indicated by grades, accrued course credits, or grade retention	1	2	3	4
c. Failure on state standardized tests	1	2	3	4
d. Behaviors that warrant suspension or expulsion	1	2	3	4
e. Behaviors that warrant other disciplinary action	1	2	3	4
f. Involvement with the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4
g. Involvement with social services or foster care	1	2	3	4
h. Pregnancy/teen parenthood	1	2	3	4
i. Substance abuse	1	2	3	4
j. Learning disability as indicated in an Individualized Education Plan (IEP)	1	2	3	4
k. Mental health problems	1	2	3	4
l. Observed change in student attitude or life conditions	1	2	3	4
m. Homelessness or frequent address change	1	2	3	4
n. Limited English proficiency	1	2	3	4
o. Migrant status	1	2	3	4
p. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

11. Does your district work with any of the following to address the needs of students at risk of dropping out? (Circle one on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. Child protective services	1	2
b. Local businesses	1	2
c. *Juvenile assessment center	1	2
d. Community mental health agency	1	2
e. Churches or community organizations (e.g., Boys & Girls Clubs, United Way, Lion's Clubs)	1	2
f. Job placement center	1	2
g. Crisis intervention center	1	2
h. Drug and/or alcohol clinic	1	2
i. Family planning/child placement agency	1	2
j. Child care centers/providers (i.e., for children of teen parents)	1	2
k. Health clinic or hospital	1	2
l. State or local government agencies that provide financial assistance to needy families	1	2
m. Other(specify)	1	2

12. When students appear highly likely to drop out of school,* does your district provide information about the employment or financial consequences of dropping out of school? (Circle one.)

Yes, this is standard procedure with all students highly likely to drop out	1
Yes, with some students	2
No	3

13. When students appear highly likely to drop out of school,* does your district provide information about the following education and training options? (Circle one on each line.)

Education and training option	Yes, this is standard procedure with all students highly likely to drop out	Yes, with some students	No
a. *Alternative schools or programs administered by your district or another entity	1	2	3
b. *Job training/GED combination programs (e.g., Job Corps)	1	2	3
c. GED or adult education programs	1	2	3
d. *Job training programs	1	2	3

14. Does your district try to determine the status of students who were expected to return to school in the fall but who do not return as expected? (Circle one.)

Yes, for all students	1
Yes, for some students	2
No	3

15. When students drop out during the school year, does your district follow up with those students sometime before the next school year to encourage them to return? (Circle one.)

Yes, for all students who drop out	1
Yes, for some students who drop out	2
No	3

16. Does your district use any of the following information to determine whether to implement additional district-wide dropout prevention efforts? (Circle one on each line.)

	Yes	No
a. Dropout rates	1	2
b. Graduation rates	1	2
c. Attendance rates	1	2
d. Number of expulsions or other disciplinary actions	1	2
e. State standardized test scores	1	2
f. Number of students attending adult education/GED program	1	2
g. Number of students taking or passing the GED test	1	2
h. Number or percentage of students failing courses or held back	1	2
i. Feedback from a district-administered parent or student survey	1	2
j. Other(specify)	1	2